

A/LG Coord

A/DB Coord

A/CS Coord

A/CT Coord

A/CC Appr

Vercruyee, Major

XPDS

1054

cb

DSARC 1A Alternatives for Air Launch Miniature System

28 JAN 1980

1. A Defense System Acquisition Review Council (DSARC) meeting on the Air Launch Miniature System is scheduled for 20 Apr 80. The alternatives to be presented at this DSARC are now being developed by the SPO, with inputs from ADC, ADTAC and the Air Staff. A major Air Force decision group (probably AF Council) will be convened in mid-February to review the alternatives and select the AF preferred alternative.

2. In order to assure an ADC position is available by 1 Feb, the attached package is provided for comment prior to receipt of the coordination copies of the Decision Coordinating Paper (DCP) and the Integrated Program Summary (IPS).

3. At Tab 1 is a position paper on the alternatives, including a recommended ADC requirement for the operational weapon system. Tab 2 is the draft of the IPS. Since it is the first draft, it is hard to understand and contradictory in a few places. The coordination copy should be much improved. Tab 3 has the working level comments sent to the SPO on this draft IPS.

4. Upon receipt of the coordination copies of the DCP/IPS, we will provide an appropriate message for ADC/CC signature. XPDS will provide a briefing on the subject if that is desired. +

RECOMMENDATION

5. Review and approve the proposed ADC position for the Air Launch Miniature System DSARC.

ORIGINAL SIGNED

WILLIAM R KENTY, Colonel, USAF
Asst DCS/Plans, Policy, Programs
and Requirements

3 Atchs

1. Position Paper on Alternatives (8)
2. DRAFT IPS (5)
3. US Working Level Comments (6)

(No record for Atchs 2 & 3.)

POSITION PAPER

OM

ASAT DSARC 1A ALTERNATIVES

INTRODUCTION

In the preliminary planning for this DSARC it was decided that three alternatives would probably be adequate to span the range of development and deployment options. Present planning leans toward the following philosophy for each alternative:

Alternative I - Continue present prototype program. Consciously limit operational features, testing, performance and maintainability/reliability in order to minimize development costs. Put this system into production (if a deployment decision is given) with attendant operational limitations. b1

Alternative II - Develop and test prototype. Add a shortened engineering development phase to make those changes/improvements necessary to meet a minimally acceptable operational requirement (added tests, improved reliability, etc.) b1

Alternative III - Structure the program like a "normal" development effort. This will have a substantial engineering development phase after the initial test program. Performance, reliability, maintainability, training and life cycle costs would all be optimized. b1

At the working level, ADC has indicated that we do not support alternative I. If alternative I is approved, it will validate the current SPO approach to building a flight test device and accepting its operational limitations if it is put into production. We are working to ensure that alternative II meets our minimum needs, with the likelihood that alternative II will be the Air Force recommended alternative at the DSARC. Alternative III, although not "gold plated" will likely be considered too expensive to be seriously considered.

DISCUSSION

Our examination of the three alternatives presented in this draft IPS resulted in the following specific recommendations:

51

a. b1

b. b1

c. b1

d. Lack of engineering development phase precludes significant reliability, maintainability and performance improvements following prototype testing.

e. Initial test program (13 live missile tests) does not meet AFTEC stated minimum need.

f. One live fire test per year provides low confidence of detecting age induced degradation.

g. Lack of weapon simulators will hamper training or cause degradation of actual weapons.

h. Use of contractor personnel for organizational and intermediate maintenance violates USAP policy for combat weapons.

i. b1

Alternative II, as it is currently defined, corrects some of the above deficiencies. In particular, it provides a minimal engineering development phase following prototype testing, and meets the AFTEC minimum initial test requirements. Alternative II will also have sufficient technical orders developed and training available to support a normal military operation at each operating base. In addition to these features, alternative II becomes minimally acceptable if the following features are added:

a. b1

b. b1

c. b1

d. Addition of an FOTSZ program to confirm performance and reliability of production weapons (estimate minimum of 8 tests).

e. Sufficient missiles are purchased to support 2 live fire tests per year.

f. Weapon simulators are provided for training.

g. b1

Alternative III should be structured for a normal weapon system development cycle, and provide for deployment of a highly effective, well tested, and readily supportable weapon system. The following features are needed for this alternative:

a. b1

b. 80 operational missiles (excluding CT&E and spares).

c. Performance optimization.

d. Addition of an POT&E phase (10-12 tests).

e. Sufficient missiles to support a minimum of 2 live fire tests per year.

f. Weapon and maintenance simulators.

g. b1

h. (U) Reduce aircraft configure/reconfigure times.

b1

RECOMMENDATION

The ADC position with regard to the DSARC alternatives be:

a. b1

b. Alternative II, with the improvements identified above, be the minimum acceptable.

c. Alternative III is preferred, assuming the IOC slip is not more than 1-2 years.

ACTION OFFICER: Maj Vererayee/XPDS/3054 DATE: 28 JAN 1980

AUTHENTICATION: ORIGINAL SIGNED DATE: 28 JAN 1980

WILLIAM R. KENTY, Colonel, USAF
Asst DCS/Plans, Policy, Programs
and Requirements